

**ARGUMENT in Favor of Proposition 60A**

*PROPOSITION 60A* gives voters the chance to reduce the cost of the bonds they overwhelmingly approved in March as part of Governor Schwarzenegger’s plan to help ease the state’s budget crisis.

Unfortunately, those bonds carry a high price in the form of interest payments. There is a solution. Experts estimate California has more than \$1,000,000,000 worth of surplus property. By requiring that proceeds from the sale of all such surplus property be used to help pay off the bonds early, *PROPOSITION 60A COULD DRAMATICALLY LOWER COSTS TO TAXPAYERS.*

Vote YES on Proposition 60A to *SAVE MONEY.*

**DAN STANFORD**, *Former Chairman  
California Fair Political Practices  
Commission*

**BARBARA O’CONNOR, Ph.D.**, *Director  
Institute for the Study of Politics & Media  
California State University, Sacramento*

**GEORGE N. ZENOVICH**, *Associate Justice  
Retired, 5<sup>th</sup> District Court of Appeal*

**REBUTTAL to Argument in Favor of Proposition 60A**

Nowhere in the support arguments for Proposition 60A do you see mention of what Proposition 60A does to actually force the sale of surplus property in California. That’s because Proposition 60A doesn’t force the sale of surplus property—it only directs that the money raised IF surplus property is sold be used to pay off bond debt.

In seeking to compromise, the backers of Proposition 60A stopped short of what needs to be done.

That may be practicing the art of the possible, but it is no less “unpalatable” and deserves a no vote.

**SENATOR BILL MORROW**  
**ASSEMBLYMEMBER SARAH REYES**